

perishable goods, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSE: Resolution of the Brotherhood of Railway Mail Clerks of Covington, Ky., asking for the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of Local Union No. 698, Newport, Ky., in relation to the extradition of John J. McNamara; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition from Frank B. Sanborn, Frederick Starr, Oswald Garrison Villard, Francis E. Woodruff, and others, praying that the President and Congress institute a special inquiry into the manner in which D. C. Worcester has discharged the duties of his office as commissioner in the Philippine Islands, said petition being based on a resolution censuring Commissioner Worcester passed by a unanimous vote of the Philippine Assembly; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, for an amendment of the corporation-tax law; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

Also, resolution of the De Witt Clinton High School, in favor of the Owen bill; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of D. E. Chase, asking reduction in duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: Papers to accompany bills granting increases of pensions to Ellen M. Cutler, Bridget Kelly, Emily F. Fish, and Mary Bonner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of J. A. Buck and 21 other citizens of Urbana, Ohio, in favor of House concurrent resolution 6, for the appointment of a committee to investigate the arrest and extradition of John J. McNamara; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Resolutions adopted by Local No. 428, Cigarmakers' Union of Trenton; Trenton Lodge, No. 398, International Association of Machinists, of Trenton; Pattern Makers' Association of Trenton and vicinity; and Mercer County Central Labor Union, all in the State of New Jersey, urging immediate action by the House of Representatives on the resolution introduced by Representative BERGER providing for an investigation by a joint committee of the House and Senate on the lawfulness of the acts of the arrest of John J. McNamara; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, additional affidavits to accompany bill (H. R. 8380) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Stringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 17, 1911.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of the Poage's Mill Sunday school, of Roanoke County, Va., and a petition of the Bethesda Sunday school, of Botetourt County, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation for the suppression of the opium evil, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the proper observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Takoma Park Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying that the extension of New Hampshire Avenue be made in a straight line, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Church of Seventh Day Adventists, of Concord, N. H., and a memorial of the congregation of the Takoma Park Seventh Day Adventists' Church, of the District of Columbia, remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the memorial of George F. Newell, of Swanzy, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Dover, N. H., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Strafford County, N. H., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh Day Adventist Church, of Concord, N. H., remonstrating against the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the memorial of Herbert H. Chamberlain, of Swanzy, N. H., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Friday Literary Club, of Bradentown, Fla., praying for the repeal of the present oleomargarine law, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Dakota County, Minn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WARREN presented a memorial of the E. Clemens Horst Co., hop growers, of San Francisco, Cal., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada and also against the passage of the so-called farmers' free-list bill and all antiprotective bills, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of the county board of officers and directors of the Ancient Order of Hibernians of Fairfield County, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a petition of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Ithaca, N. Y., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1627) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across and over the Arkansas River, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 27) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 850) to amend an act entitled "An act to legalize and establish a pontoon railway bridge across the Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, and to authorize the construction of a similar bridge at or near Clinton, Iowa," approved June 6, 1874 (Rept. No. 26); and

A bill (S. 144) to legalize a bridge across the Pend Oreille River in Stevens County, Wash. (Rept. No. 25).

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2003) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make partial payments for work already done under public contracts, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 28) thereon.

Mr. BURNHAM. A number of petitions have been received relating to cold storage, which have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As the bill (S. 136) to prevent the sale or transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of articles of food held in cold storage for more than the time herein specified, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, is in the hands of the Committee on Manufactures, I report back the petitions and move that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from their further consideration and that they be referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

The motion was agreed to.

### LANDS AT PORT ANGELES, WASH.

Mr. JONES. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 339) providing for the reappraisal and sale of certain lands in the town site of Port Angeles, Wash., and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 24) thereon. It is a short bill and a



similar measure has previously passed the Senate. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the bill and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### REGULATION OF FISHERIES.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 12) to give effect to the provisions of a treaty between the United States and Great Britain concerning the fisheries in boundary waters contiguous to the United States and the Dominion of Canada, signed at Washington on April 1, 1908, and ratified by the United States Senate April 13, 1908.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will not object to the request made by the Senator from Michigan, but I give notice that I shall object to further requests for unanimous consent to consider bills until the morning business has been concluded. I will do so after this matter has been disposed of.

Mr. JONES. Unless there is some special reason why this bill should be passed soon, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan to let it go over for a short time, because I had considerable correspondence with some gentlemen from my State with reference to this measure before it was reported. I have written to them and sent them a copy of the report and bill, and I wish to find out whether they have any objection to urge against the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the object in pressing the bill for final passage is this: The treaty between these two countries was made and promulgated three years ago. In order to give it effect the regulations must be agreed upon between the two countries, and the regulations as they appear in Senate bill 12 have been agreed upon. They affect the right of fishermen to use certain sized nets in boundary waters, and if the treaty regulations are to go into effect, the fishermen must have ample notice of that fact. Otherwise they will not know what to do with reference to the purchase of new nets.

We have held the bill for over a year, in order to correct some of its details. About every section of the country directly affected by it has been consulted, and I had supposed that the interests of the Pacific coast, as well as all other interests affected, were perfectly satisfied with the regulations.

I do not like to be insistent when a Senator asks that we may delay a measure, and I could not proceed with it except by unanimous consent; but the Committee on Foreign Relations directed me to make this report, and have asked me to bring it to the attention of the Senate. I have done so; but I am not going to press it if the Senator from Washington asks for further time.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the Senator that I am satisfied I can get word by Monday, and I really do not anticipate from my examination of the bill and the report that there will be any objection at all to the measure. But these gentlemen presented such serious objections to the regulations as they were proposed that I felt I ought to submit the matter to them before the passage of the bill. So I ask that it may go over.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Under the circumstances, I will withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan withdraws the request for the consideration of the bill.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2359) granting an increase of pension to George S. Arnold;

A bill (S. 2360) granting an increase of pension to David Cain;

A bill (S. 2361) granting an increase of pension to Eli B. Riggs; and

A bill (S. 2362) granting a pension to Mary V. Harris; to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GALLINGER. On the 6th day of April last I introduced a bill (S. 22) to establish and disburse a public-school teachers' retirement fund in the District of Columbia. I have been requested to introduce another bill on the same subject, which I think differs somewhat from the one now before the committee. I introduce this bill by request, and ask that it go to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2363) to establish and disburse a public-school teachers' retirement fund in the District of Columbia (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCUMBER:

A bill (S. 2364) for the relief of Capt. James Ronayne, United States Army; and

A bill (S. 2365) for the relief of Capt. Frederick B. Shaw; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WETMORE:

A bill (S. 2366) to acquire land along the course of Rock Creek for the purpose of preventing the pollution and obstruction thereof, and of connecting Potomac Park with the Zoological Park and Rock Creek Park, and providing a new location for the United States Botanic Garden; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2367) to protect migratory wild fowl in the United States; to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

A bill (S. 2368) granting a pension to Fanny L. Graham (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2369) granting an increase of pension to William H. Tinkham (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2370) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN:

A bill (S. 2371) to amend section 3224 of the United States Compiled Statutes so as to prevent the restraining of the assessment or collection of any tax—State, county, municipal, district, or Federal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2372) to amend an act to create a commerce court and to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as heretofore amended, and for other purposes, by adding a section thereto; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2373) to appoint Col. William F. Stewart, United States Army, retired, to the rank of brigadier general on the retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 2374) to amend an act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CULBERSON. I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I will state that it is a copy of the act approved July 2, 1890, known as the antitrust law, with certain additions. I ask that it be printed, so that the proposed interlineations may be printed in small caps. The Committee on the Judiciary considered and reported the original bill, and I ask that this bill be referred to the same committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order will be entered for the printing of the bill in the manner suggested by the Senator from Texas.

By Mr. CULBERSON:

A bill (S. 2375) to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 2376) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Ellis R. Douglass (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2377) granting a pension to Jennie A. Pettingell (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2378) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Carter (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 2379) granting a pension to Addie Roof; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 2380) granting a pension to William McCabe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 2381) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased;

A bill (S. 2382) for the relief of Frederick Hughson;

A bill (S. 2383) for the relief of the heirs of Lemmus J. Spence, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2384) for the relief of Thomas Johnson or his legal representatives; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 2385) granting a pension to Frederica R. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 2386) for the relief of Alberti Operti;

A bill (S. 2387) for the relief of Alberti Operti; and

A bill (S. 2388) for the relief of Alberti Operti; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 2389) for the relief of the Alabama Great Southern Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2390) for the relief of the representatives of the estate of Henry C. Sills, deceased;

A bill (S. 2391) for the relief of W. R. Hall;

A bill (S. 2392) for the relief of the estate of Edward Bedsole, deceased;

A bill (S. 2393) for the relief of the heirs of John L. Hayes, deceased;

A bill (S. 2394) for the relief of Samuel H. Yarborough and estate of John Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 2395) for the relief of the heirs or estate of James M. Alexander, deceased;

A bill (S. 2396) for the relief of A. J. Southard;

A bill (S. 2397) for the relief of the heirs of Calvin Lacy;

A bill (S. 2398) for the relief of Turner Jones;

A bill (S. 2399) for the relief of the Alabama Great Southern Railroad Co.;

A bill (S. 2400) for the relief of Susan Seymour, heir of Edward H. Wade, deceased;

A bill (S. 2401) for the relief of David C. and Daniel W. Reece, heirs of Andrew Reece, deceased;

A bill (S. 2402) for the relief of William J. Hammond and Francis M. Warren, heirs of the estate of Solomon Kean, deceased;

A bill (S. 2403) for the relief of Dempsey Smith, heir of Wade Smith, deceased;

A bill (S. 2404) for the relief of heirs or estate of C. C. Blancit, deceased;

A bill (S. 2405) for the relief of Samuel H. Yarbrough and estate of John Jones, deceased;

A bill (S. 2406), for the relief of heirs or estates of Elbert H. Ellett and Malinda Ellett, deceased;

A bill (S. 2407) for the relief of James Williams;

A bill (S. 2408) for the relief of the heirs or estate of W. C. Burlison, deceased;

A bill (S. 2409) for the relief of Thomas Seymour;

A bill (S. 2410) for the relief of heirs or estate of Benjamin Lawler, deceased;

A bill (S. 2411) for the relief of Salina E. Lauderdale;

A bill (S. 2412) for the relief of Lewis Metz;

A bill (S. 2413) for the relief of William W. Callahan, administrator of the estate of Thomas Gibbs;

A bill (S. 2414) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore; and

A bill (S. 2415) for the relief of Dr. J. L. Vineyard; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2416) granting a pension to Jennings J. Pierce (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2417) granting a pension to Andrew J. Tidwell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2418) granting a pension to Janie Atnip;

A bill (S. 2419) granting a pension to Daniel S. Jones;

A bill (S. 2420) granting a pension to William M. Hall;

A bill (S. 2421) granting an increase of pension to Ernest Newbauer;

A bill (S. 2422) granting an increase of pension to William Pritchard;

A bill (S. 2423) granting an increase of pension to Mary Walls;

A bill (S. 2424) granting a pension to Elias Brown; and

A bill (S. 2425) granting an increase of pension to T. L. Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRANDEGEE:

A bill (S. 2426) to incorporate the "Descendants of the Signers"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JOHN B. LEE.

On motion of Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of John B. Lee (S. 7023), Sixty-first Congress, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### COST OF LIVING IN AMERICAN TOWNS.

On motion of Mr. SMOOT, it was

Ordered, That 500 copies of Senate Document No. 22, on Cost of Living in American Towns, be printed for the use of the Senate document room.

#### THE STANDARD OIL CO. ET AL. V. THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have received many telegrams and letters this morning from different sections of the country asking that the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Standard Oil case be printed as a public document (S. Doc. No. 34). I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the decision be printed, and also that the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan be printed in the same document—5,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand that the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan probably has not been fully prepared or revised, and if the opinion of the majority of the court, delivered by the Chief Justice, is printed, I suggest that the dissenting opinion as delivered from the bench, and which has been published, go along with the main opinion at the same time.

Mr. SMOOT. Would the Senator object to withholding the publication of the document until the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Harlan is ready?

Mr. CULBERSON. I do not object to taking time to get both complete, but I object to printing the main opinion first and the dissenting opinion afterwards.

Mr. SMOOT. I will see that the document is not printed until both opinions are ready.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will then be, if there be no objection, that both opinions be printed in one document.

#### DEMOCRACY AND ART.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to have printed as a document an article by Dr. W. K. Bush-Brown on the subject of "Democracy and art." I ask that the article be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paper presented by the Senator from Idaho will be referred to the Committee on Printing for recommendation.

#### PULP AND NEWS-PRINT-PAPER INDUSTRY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 31), which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I have the honor to transmit herewith a report on the pulp and news-print-paper industry by the Tariff Board. In response to a resolution of the Senate dated February 23, 1911, I forwarded a report by the Tariff Board answering as far as practicable the inquiries of that resolution. That report contained a preliminary report on the pulp and news-print-paper industry.

As will be seen from the letter of transmittal, the present report is not a supplement to the preliminary report, but is a complete unit in itself.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 1911.

#### AUTHORITY OVER WATER POWER IN STATES.

Mr. JONES. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 44), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate be, and it is hereby, directed to report to the Senate, at as early a date as possible in the next regular session of Congress, upon the power and authority of the National Government over the development and use of water power within the respective States, and especially—

First. Has the National Government any authority to impose a charge for the use of water power developed on nonnavigable streams, whether State or interstate?

Second. Has it any authority in granting permits to develop water power on a navigable stream to impose and enforce conditions relating to stated payments to the Government, regulation of charges to consumers, and determination of the right to make use of such developed power?

Third. Has it authority in disposing of any of its lands, reserved or unreserved, necessary and suitable for use in connection with the development or use of water power on a nonnavigable stream, whether State or interstate, by lease or otherwise, to limit the time for which such development may continue or to impose and enforce charges for the use and development of such water power or to control and regulate the disposition of such water power to its consumers?



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HEYBURN. Let the resolution go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made, and the resolution goes over.

#### FEDERAL ANTITRUST DECISIONS.

Mr. GORE. I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask that it be read.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 3) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound 3,000 copies of the Federal antitrust decisions, 1890 to 1911, to be compiled by the direction of the Department of Justice, 1,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.*

Mr. GORE. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INVESTIGATIONS OF ADVANCES IN RATES BY CARRIERS.

Mr. CUMMINS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 43), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce be, and is hereby, authorized to have made for use of Members of the Senate an index-digest of the record (already printed) in Senate Documents Nos. 3400 and 3500, Interstate Commerce Commission, entitled "In re Investigations of Advances in Rates by Carriers," etc., at a cost not to exceed \$1,500, payable as the work progresses, on warrants or orders of the chairman of said committee, out of the contingent fund of the Senate.*

#### ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move that the Senate proceed to the election of a President pro tempore of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and vote for the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. I desire to say that I will consider this announcement made as to any subsequent ballot on this question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. BOURNE's name was called). The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I am instructed to say that if he were present he would vote for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP].

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON]. I desire this announcement to stand for the day. I vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. DIXON (when his name was called). I am paired for the day with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE]. If he were present, I should vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. He being absent, I withhold my vote and let this announcement stand for the rest of the day.

Mr. CRAWFORD (when Mr. GAMBLE's name was called). My colleague [Mr. GAMBLE] is unavoidably absent. He requested me to say that if he were present he would vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I make this statement for the rest of the day.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER], who is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I therefore withhold my vote. I make this announcement for the balance of the day.

Mr. CUMMINS (when Mr. KENYON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. KENYON] is unavoidably absent from the city to-day and will be for some days to come.

Mr. McCUMBER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. PERCY]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GAMBLE] and will vote. I make this announcement for any subsequent vote to-day upon the same subject. I vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. GORE (when Mr. OWEN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. OWEN] is necessarily absent from the Senate and from the city. I make this announcement for the day.

Mr. DU PONT (when Mr. RICHARDSON's name was called). My colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr.

SMITH]. If my colleague were present and free to vote, he would vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON]. I make this announcement for the day should there be any other votes on this question.

Mr. WATSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRIGGS]. If he were present he would vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and I should vote for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON].

I also desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. CHILTON] is necessarily absent from the Senate. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]. If my colleague were present, he would vote for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] and the senior Senator from Illinois would vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BORAH (after having voted for Mr. GALLINGER). I observe that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] is not in the Chamber. I have a pair with the Senator from Minnesota, and in view of his absence I will withdraw my vote.

Mr. DIXON. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. BOURNE] to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and will vote. I vote for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER].

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama. I desire to announce for the day that the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS] is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LORIMER].

Mr. CULBERSON. I am requested to announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is unavoidably absent to-day, is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. RICHARDSON]. If the Senator from South Carolina were present he would vote for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON].

The roll call resulted as follows:

#### FOR MR. BACON—32.

Bailey	Gore	Myers	Simmons
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Stone
Chamberlain	Johnston, Ala.	Overman	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Pomerene	Taylor
Culbertson	Lea	Rayner	Terrell
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Reed	Thornton
Foster	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Williams

#### FOR MR. GALLINGER—30.

Bradley	Dillingham	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Brandeggee	Dixon	Nelson	Smoot
Brown	du Pont	Nixon	Sutherland
Burnham	Heyburn	Oliver	Townsend
Burton	Jones	Page	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Penrose	Wetmore
Crane	Lodge	Perkins	
Curtis	McCumber	Root	

#### FOR MR. CLAPP—7.

Bristow	Cummins	La Follette	Works
Crawford	Gronna	Poindexter	

#### FOR MR. LODGE—1.

Gallinger

#### FOR MR. TILLMAN—1.

Bacon.

#### NOT VOTING—20.

Borah	Cullom	Kenyon	Richardson
Bourne	Davis	Lorimer	Smith, S. C.
Briggs	Frye	Owen	Stephenson
Chilton	Gamble	Paynter	Tillman
Clapp	Guggenheim	Percy	Watson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-one Senators have voted; necessary to a choice, 36. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has 32, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] has 30, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has 7, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has 1, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has 1. There is no choice. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). With the same announcement of the transfer of pairs that I previously made, I vote for the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. BORAH (when his name was called). I make the same announcement that I made on the former vote.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAYNTER].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WATSON. The announcement of pairs that I made on the former vote stands for to-day.

The roll call, having been concluded, resulted as follows:

FOR MR. BACON—32.

Bailey	Gore	Myers	Simmons
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Stone
Chamberlain	Johnston, Ala.	Overman	Swanson
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Pomerene	Taylor
Culberson	Lea	Rayner	Terrell
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Reed	Thornton
Foster	Martine, N. J.	Shively	Williams

FOR MR. GALLINGER—29.

Bradley	Dillingham	Nelson	Smoot
Brandegee	du Pont	Nixon	Sutherland
Brown	Heyburn	Oliver	Townsend
Burnham	Jones	Page	Warren
Burton	Lippitt	Penrose	Wetmore
Clark, Wyo.	Lodge	Perkins	
Crane	McCumber	Root	
Curtis	McLean	Smith, Mich.	

FOR MR. CLAPP—7.

Bristow	Cummins	La Follette	Works
Crawford	Gronna	Polindexter	

FOR MR. LODGE—1.

Gallinger.

FOR MR. TILLMAN—1.

Bacon.

NOT VOTING—21.

Borah	Davis	Lorimer	Stephenson
Bourne	Dixon	Owen	Tillman
Briggs	Frye	Paynter	Watson
Chilton	Gamble	Percy	
Clapp	Guggenheim	Richardson	
Cullom	Kenyon	Smith, S. C.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have voted; necessary to a choice, 36. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has 32, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] 29, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] 7, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] 1, and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] 1. There is no choice.

ELECTION OF SENATORS BY DIRECT VOTE.

Mr. BORAH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW].

Mr. CRAWFORD obtained the floor.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for a moment to present a matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

MEMBER OF BOARD OF MANAGERS OF NATIONAL SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. WARREN. Last month I introduced and asked for the consideration of a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) for appointment of a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. The man whose name I presented is an ex-Senator who has done faithful and valuable service in the United States Senate, an old soldier who served with distinction through the Civil War, and always the friend of the soldier, whether in public or private life. Although the measure carried unanimously, a motion to reconsider has since been entered. I now wish to present a letter from ex-Senator Scott, which I ask may be read, and then I will ask unanimous consent to strike from the calendar the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR WARREN: In your personal friendship for me you introduced a joint resolution naming me as a member to fill a vacancy on the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

The resolution was offered without my knowledge, as you know. I am informed that a member of the Military Committee objects. I therefore ask that you withdraw the said resolution.

Thanking you and my former associates in the Senate for the prompt passage of the resolution, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

N. B. SCOTT.

MAY 10, 1911.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent to strike from the calendar Order No. 1, which is the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that the previous action of the Senate will have to be reconsidered—

Mr. WARREN. Very well. Then I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (continuing). As a motion to reconsider is pending.

Mr. CUMMINS. A parliamentary inquiry. What would be the effect upon the order of business already established of

taking up this matter for consideration? The Senate has voted to take up for consideration—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is occupying the floor by unanimous consent.

Mr. WARREN. By consent of the Senator having the floor and by unanimous consent.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that, but if the Senate takes up for consideration another legislative matter, it seems to me it will displace the joint resolution called up by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. GALLINGER and others. Oh, no.

Mr. WARREN. We are still in the morning hour—

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that.

Mr. WARREN. And I asked unanimous consent.

Mr. CUMMINS. I asked the Chair as a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not a question of laying aside House joint resolution 39, because that comes up on motion; but it can be temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent and this measure disposed of, and then the Senate will return to the consideration of the House joint resolution.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that; but it has not been temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not need to be temporarily laid aside by unanimous consent. It can be displaced by unanimous consent.

Mr. CUMMINS. I simply want to preserve the order that has been established. I have no objection whatever to the motion proposed by the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood, when the Senator from Idaho yielded to the Senator from Wyoming, that he would allow him temporarily to displace the House joint resolution and dispose of this measure.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from South Dakota addressed the Chair presumably upon the joint resolution which had already been taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is aware of that.

Mr. CUMMINS. And the Senator from South Dakota yielded to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. For this purpose only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming thereupon asked unanimous consent to dispose of this measure now, and as there was no objection the measure was taken up.

Mr. CUMMINS. If after the disposition of the matter proposed by the Senator from Wyoming the joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution at once takes its place before the Senate, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Certainly it will, in the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the votes by which the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 14) for appointment of a member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, be reconsidered, with a view of thereafter moving the indefinite postponement of the joint resolution.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the indefinite postponement of the joint resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Before that order is made I simply desire to say that I entered the motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed, not in any spirit of hostility at all to ex-Senator Scott. I have great personal regard and admiration for him as a man and as one of the defenders of the country when it needed a defense. My only purpose was, not being present when the joint resolution was adopted, to give the Grand Army people of my State an opportunity to be heard. They had written to me with regard to the vacancy which had been caused by the death of one of the past commanders of that State, and I entered the motion in order to hold it in statu quo until I might hear from them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming that the joint resolution be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will lay before the Senate the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] to the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, on January 26, 1911, the President of the United States sent a special message to the two Houses of the Sixty-first Congress, transmitting corre-



spondence embodying an agreement between the Department of State and the Canadian Government in regard to certain proposed reciprocal tariff legislation; also statistical information showing the effect of the proposed agreement upon the commerce and revenues of the United States and the Dominion of Canada. No more important and notable document has been received from a President of these United States in many a year.

It is of the highest importance, because it proposes a complete—and I may say radical—change in the policy and attitude of the Government of the United States toward what has heretofore been regarded as the most fundamental as well as the greatest of all our industries—agriculture—its purpose being to remove absolutely all duties from the farm products hereafter grown in the Dominion of Canada, a great empire with unlimited possibilities for the growth of identically the same crops as those grown throughout the northern part of the United States; an empire stretching in vast area 3,700 miles across our entire northern boundary; the only country in the world whose people can compete with ours, on the North American Continent, in the production and sale of Temperate Zone soil products; it proposes to exempt these products from all duty, whether for revenue or protection, and to allow them henceforth free access to the markets of the United States upon a basis of absolute equality with the products of the farms in this country.

It is a notable document because of its great clearness of statement, the kindness of the sentiment it expresses, the loftiness of its tone, and the desire so deeply manifest to promote a feeling of amity and good will between two kindred peoples. The President says:

This trade agreement, if entered into, will cement the friendly relations with the Dominion which have resulted from the satisfactory settlement of the controversies that have lasted for a century and further promote good feeling between kindred peoples. \* \* \* The geographical proximity, the closer relation of blood, common sympathies, and identical moral and social ideas furnish very real and striking reasons why this agreement ought to be viewed from a higher plane.

Since becoming a nation Canada has been our good neighbor, immediately contiguous across a wide continent without artificial or natural barrier, except navigable waters used in common. She has cost us nothing in the way of preparations for defense against her possible assault, and she never will. She has sought to agree with us quickly when differences have disturbed our relations. She shares with us common traditions and aspirations.

Notwithstanding the fine optimism with which the President commends the proposed measure, he is cautious in what he says about its bringing about a reduction in the cost of living in the United States. He says:

I do not wish to hold out the prospect that the unrestricted interchange of food products will greatly and at once reduce their cost to the people of this country. \* \* \* Reciprocity with Canada must necessarily be chiefly confined in its effect on the cost of living to food and forest products. The question of the cost of clothing as affected by duty on textiles and their raw materials, so much mooted, is not within the scope of an agreement with Canada, because she raises comparatively few wool sheep and her textile manufactures are unimportant.

So the President, who is its most enthusiastic advocate, makes no promise that this measure will reduce the cost of food products to the consumer in the United States; he frankly admits that it will not in the slightest degree affect the cotton and woolen schedules, and that the cost of clothing will not be reduced in any manner as the result of its enactment.

If this proposed law is not to reduce the cost of food products, nor of clothing, to the consumers in this country, are we to enact it simply upon the ground that it will "cement the friendly relations" already existing between the Dominion and the United States?

Those relations have been unbroken for a hundred years. Is there any need just now of changing our policies, in order that they may continue in the future as they have in the past? Are we not enjoying our full share of the Dominion's trade now?

In the year 1910 Canada's total trade with the world was \$693,211,221. Her imports were \$385,833,103. Of this amount she imported \$233,071,155 from the United States, and only \$152,763,910 from the rest of the world. She bought from the people of the United States what amounts to about \$30 worth of goods for each one of her 7,500,000 people. During the same year our imports from Canada were \$95,123,310, about \$1 for each of our 95,000,000 people. The Canadians purchased from us \$30 worth of goods per capita, and we purchased from them \$1 per capita.

The most cordial relations exist between the two peoples. There is no crying demand for a change on the part of the Canadians. They firmly adhere to a protective tariff upon manufactured articles and are careful not to change that policy in this trade agreement. Of present trade conditions we certainly can not complain. In 1910 Canada's trade with the United States was \$53,000,000 more than with Great Britain; in 1909 our sales to Canada were \$192,661,000 and Great Britain's sales

to her were only \$86,257,000, notwithstanding she gives the mother country a preferential tariff rate 33½ per cent below the rate imposed against us. She is our third best customer, and if cotton were eliminated she would rank second. She is growing and prosperous and exceedingly friendly. She insists upon a tariff wall against us, to protect her growing manufacturing interests, and without resentment we cheerfully recognize her right to do so. We shall not quarrel with her because she refuses to change her protective policy for the sole purpose of "cementing friendly relations" with us.

If we could have a reciprocal treaty with Canada under which trade in the products of each country would flow back and forth between the two as freely as it does now between the great States of Pennsylvania and New York, it may be that it would be a good thing for both countries, considering the situation and cost of production in each, and that each "would find in loss a gain to match"; but Canada herself makes that impossible. It is her firmly adopted policy to build up her own manufacturing industries under a protective tariff, and we can not persuade her to change that policy. The proposed trade agreement is the limit beyond which she will not go on her side. If we enact this law as proposed, without amendment, it will give to Canada free admission into the markets of the United States for her farm products without a sufficient "quid pro quo" to our people as a whole.

She will have secured what she wants without giving up anything in return. Having obtained that, she will not advance one step nearer.

So we must face this proposed law as the limit beyond which she will firmly decline to pass, unless we insist upon amending it now.

The main question for us to decide, then, is: Shall we accept this bill unchanged and admit the farm products of Canada into the United States free of duty, leaving a duty upon what the President calls "secondary food products, or foodstuffs partly manufactured"; a tariff to remain on lumber, except rough boards, and each of the Canadian Provinces reserving the right to impose export duties on wood pulp, pulp wood, and news print paper; a tariff to remain on manufactured products generally when imported by one of the countries from the other?

Mr. President, I can not give my assent to this proposal, because, in the first place, I do not believe it will promote the general welfare of the people of the United States; in the second place, it will, in my judgment, do irreparable harm to agriculture, which is our greatest industry.

The proposed law is, in effect, a declaration that we intend no longer to depend upon the cultivation of our own soil and the industry of the American farmer for our food supplies, and that agriculture in the United States is no longer to hold its imperial place at the head of our great industries, but is henceforth to be treated as a pursuit of lesser importance among American people, because from this time on we shall look beyond these American farms into foreign lands and we shall invite the whole world, upon equal terms, to compete with the American farmer in his own market place. In the third place, the law, as proposed, gives an unfair advantage to and an unjust discrimination in favor of certain trusts in the United States without giving any relief to the consumer from the burden of the cost of living, against which he bitterly complains.

The policy of this legislation is to recognize the people of the United States, not as a people engaged in agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, with the dominating influence in agricultural pursuits and in rural communities, but an urban people engaged in manufacturing and commercial pursuits, with its dominating and formative national tendencies in the great cities and congested centers; a people who shun the country as a place of solitude and loneliness and the tiller of the soil as a vanishing type, who will disappear from the land in a few more generations. This proposed law not only recognizes this tendency, but will accentuate it ten thousand fold.

Mr. President, we are seemingly unaware of the remarkable influx of humanity that is swiftly changing the entire current of our national life. What a vast difference between the conditions which prevail in a farming community in the West, several hundred miles distant from a city, and the conditions of life in the East Side, in the Bronx, or in lower Manhattan, in the great city of New York.

I have examined with great interest the report of the New York City commission on "Congestion of population," made on the 28th day of February last, in which it quotes the following, written in 1905 by Mr. Lawrence Veiller, a well-known housing expert:

No conception of the existing conditions can be obtained from any general statements. To say that the lower East Side of New York is the most densely populated spot in the habitable globe gives no adequate idea of the real conditions. To say that in one section of the city the



density of the population is 1,000 to the acre; and that the greatest density of population in the most densely populated part of Bombay is but 759 to the acre; in Prague, 485 to the acre; in Paris, 434; in London, 365; in Glasgow, 350; in Calcutta, 204, gives one no adequate realization of the state of affairs. No more does it to say that in many city blocks on the East Side there is often a population of from 2,000 to 3,000 persons, a population equal to that of a good-sized village.

The only way that one can understand the real conditions is to go down into the streets of these districts and see the thousands of persons thronging there and making them impassable. So congested have become the conditions of some of the quarters of this city that it is not an exaggeration to say that there are more people living there than the land or the atmosphere can safely sustain. The limits have not only been reached, but have long been passed.

The New York City commission to which I have referred also quotes the following from a book published last year by Mr. Veiller, called "The housing problem," in which the author charges that—

The conditions of New York are without parallel in the civilized world. In no city in Europe, not in Naples nor in Rome, neither in London nor in Paris, neither in Berlin nor Budapest, not in Constantinople nor in St. Petersburg, not in ancient Edinburgh nor modern Glasgow, not in heathen Canton nor Bombay are to be found such conditions as prevail in modern, enlightened, twentieth-century, Christian New York.

In no other city is the mass of the working population housed as it is in New York, in tall tenement houses extending up into the air 50 or 60 feet and stretching for miles in every direction as far as the eye can reach.

In no other city are there the same appalling conditions with regard to lack of light and air in the homes of the poor. In no other city is there so great congestion and overcrowding. In no other city do the poor so suffer from excessive rents. In no other city are the conditions of city life so complex. Nowhere are the evils of modern life so varied. Nowhere are the problems so difficult of solution.

This commission, appointed under the administration of Mayor Gaynor, reports that the congestion so scathingly arraigned by Mr. Veiller in 1905 is growing worse and is still increasing in the sections of the city which had even in that year the greatest density of population per acre. While the commission was preparing its report, a building of 55 stories was planned for lower Manhattan, and yet the commission reports that in a six-story tenement, under existing laws, it is possible that only one room out of four will obtain an adequate supply of sunshine, and that it is possible to cover an entire plot of land adjacent to such a tenement house by a factory or warehouse of almost any height; that in this way a tenement house may be deprived not only of light, but of ventilation, for the yards or shafts become closed ducts. It reports that in certain blocks in the Borough of Manhattan no thorough ventilation can be had by reason of the fact that these various buildings surround the tenement house. The congestion is growing worse. In the block in Manhattan bounded by Grand, Broome, Ridge, and Pitt Streets the population increased from 1,845 to 2,552 from 1905 to 1910, an increase in that one block of 709. In that district there was an increase from 910 per acre to 1,260 per acre. The commission goes on to say:

A study of the changes in density of population from 1905 to 1910 of 28 important blocks in the lower part of the Bronx which had in 1905 a population of 1,000 or over is even more significant, because near many of these blocks are others practically unimproved, and within walking distance of some are scores of acres of vacant lands.

In these crowded tenements parents, children, and from three to eight adult boarders are often found occupying apartments of two, three, and four rooms.

In 122 blocks in Manhattan, which in 1905 had a density of over 750 people per acre, 65 per cent were foreign born, the Italians and Russians predominating. In 1905 the foreign-born population of Manhattan Borough was 890,142, and 23 per cent of these were domiciled in blocks having a density of over 750 per acre, while only 9 per cent of American-born people were living under like conditions. South of Fourteenth Street, on the East Side, the native-born population from 1900 to 1905 increased less than 4 per cent, while the foreign born increased nearly 20 per cent. There were many other districts where the number of native born in 1905 was actually less than in 1900. The tenement house commissioners report that to provide a good standard of housing for unskilled wage earners in New York City the maximum value of the land occupied by a tenement should not exceed 50 cents per square foot, but that in 1908 the assessed value of land per square foot occupied by the congested blocks of lower Manhattan ranged from \$2.74 to \$16, and in most of these blocks exceeded \$10 per square foot. They find that a large part of the juvenile delinquencies, which are so serious in these congested districts, is directly traceable to the congested conditions of population among a large portion of the families from which the delinquents come.

Mr. Ernest K. Coulter, clerk of the children's court of New York County, told the commissioners that congestion is responsible for a vast number of the cases that come into the children's court of New York City. He said:

Environment counts nine-tenths in the whole proposition of juvenile delinquency.

He gave many instances of the results of room overcrowding, and claimed that children often come to feel that they are not wanted in their so-called homes, and that they are really forced to the streets. He says that the most skillful pickpockets in New York City are children from these places, and that their ranks are constantly being recruited from the districts where there is the greatest congestion.

Hon. William McAdoo, chief city magistrate, gave the following as his observation:

I think there can be no question but what the connection between congestion of population, especially in that form which it takes in the tenement houses, and crime and delinquency is very marked.

The crowded living conditions in these small rooms, lack of personal privacy, and separation of the sexes must, in the very nature of things, beget conditions which conduce to immorality and the lack of self-respect. I think that the poor family in the country, however impoverished, has a much better chance of bringing up the children to lead clean moral lives and be less sophisticated as to vice than children brought up in the congested quarters of the city. For instance, said he, I recently visited what are called the "agricultural slums" in the congested districts of Ireland, in a mountainous and very healthy country, where the indoor life is cramped and poverty obvious, but where the outdoor life is very healthful and the climate moderate and even the moral and religious atmosphere excellent; and I should hesitate, if it had been left to me to transplant these people to the crowded tenements of the East Side, even if they got more food and better clothing than they did in the old country. The percentage of crime amongst these people in the old land is so low as to be scarcely perceptible, and they lead clean, moral lives, stimulated under adverse conditions by high spiritual exaltation and deep reverence.

The tenement commissioners find that one of the principal causes of this congestion is poverty; another, lack of control over aliens and citizens; another, high price of land in the city.

Shall we now accentuate the evil by adopting a national policy of discrimination against the American farm, thus encouraging the tendency to smother the life of our race in these congested centers?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Root in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. REED. If the people of New York City are in the desperate condition pictured, does the Senator think that we can aid them by increasing the price of farm products by taxation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We certainly can stop country people from flocking to the cities if we make it possible for them to make a living on their farms. I shall later elaborate on that a little further.

Mr. REED. I understood the Senator to say that those people were nearly all coming, not from farms in the Dakotas and Iowa, but from foreign countries.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In those particular localities. I do not wish the Senator to understand me that that is a situation which would apply, so far as the farm element is concerned, to all cities, his own, for instance. I shall, as I proceed, make that clear.

The positive menace this abnormal congestion of our population is to the public welfare was the subject of a conference held in New York in 1908. The little group of humanitarians who had been fighting bad housing, tuberculosis, insufficient schools, dearth of parks and playgrounds, ill health, accidents, and juvenile crimes concluded that the only cure for the evils of congestion is the abolition of congestion. A writer, giving an account of that meeting in the *Charities and the Commons* of April 4, 1908, says:

Within 19 miles of City Hall a population numbering 5,404,638 human souls lives and works. If the increase continues at the same pace as during the last 50 years, there will reside in Greater New York alone, in the year 1950, 25,000,000 souls. Such figures would be appalling enough if the population were distributed over the whole city area, but it is packed upon a small part of the area. Eleven New York blocks have a density of 1,200 per acre, which means that if the whole of little Delaware were similarly crowded it could contain the entire population of the world—white, black, yellow, and red.

But these conditions are not confined to New York City. In *Charities and the Commons* for May 9, 1908, Jacob A. Riis writes thus about the city of St. Louis:

Hear the report of the housing committee of the Civic League just made. It deals with that district between Seventh and Fourteenth Streets, Lucas Avenue, and O'Fallon Streets, comprising 48 blocks, where the poor live in neglected rear tenements, sometimes two, and in one case three, upon the same lot beside the front of the house. The lower rooms of these houses might, for all the sunlight they receive, be at the bottom of a well. Dilapidation, misery, and dirt reach their depths in the rear buildings. People who live in them are poorer, more sickly, less cleanly, and generally of a lower standard in every way.

Mr. President, I could go on indefinitely and present similar pictures showing similar conditions of congestion in Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburg, and other American cities, but I have presented enough to call attention to what, it appears to me,



is most unwise in this proposed change in our national attitude toward the American farmer, and that is this:

It will inevitably accentuate the tendency to leave the country and crowd into these cities, which are already too large, and it will depress and discourage the farming industry of the United States. Why was it necessary to raise any question of doubt on the part of the Government as to the ability of the American farmer to supply the domestic demands of his own country for farm products, and why was it necessary to create in his mind an apprehension that his occupation will be attended in the future with greater risk and uncertainty than before, because his competitors, living in another land and giving adhesion to another flag, are invited by his Government to bring the competing products of their soils into this market which he has created, and, without the payment of even a duty for revenue, allowed to compete against him in the land of his own domicile?

The Agricultural Yearbook for 1909 shows a condition of agriculture in the United States that should not be threatened by the passage of this proposed Canadian free trade in farm products. In it we are told by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, that—

The value of the farm products is so incomprehensibly large that it has become merely a row of figures. For this year it is \$8,760,000,000; the gain of this year over the preceding year is \$869,000,000. Ten years ago the value of the product of the farm was only five and one-half times the mere gain of this year over 1908; it was little more than one-half of the total value of this year. It has advanced year by year during the last 11 years. It has paid off mortgages; it has established banks; it has made better homes; it has helped to make the farmer a citizen of the world; it has provided him with means for improving his soil and making it more productive.

There is no evidence in this Yearbook that the farms of the United States are rapidly approaching a time when they will not be able to provide enough food products to meet the demands of our own people or when we shall be obliged to go into the markets of the world to buy our bread and meat.

The corn crop this year was greater than the average crop of the five preceding years by  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. We raised 2,767,000,000 bushels of corn in 1909. We had the largest wheat crop in six years with two exceptions. We raised a crop of 725,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1909. We raised 64,000,000 tons of hay, nearly 3 per cent more than the average for the five preceding years; 984,000,000 bushels of oats, 12 per cent more than the average of the five preceding years; 165,000,000 bushels of barley, 6 per cent more than the average of the five preceding years; 367,000,000 bushels of potatoes, 24 per cent more than the average of the five preceding years; also 25,767,000 bushels of flaxseed and 31,000,000 bushels of rye, which was a full average yield in each case.

The total crop of all cereals was 9,711,000,000 bushels in 1909, which was  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent higher than the average of the preceding five years. Production is not falling off, but increasing. The values both of the farms and their products are substantial and are based upon the natural law of supply and demand. Each farmer is an independent unit. He possesses no wealth created out of monopoly or by issuing watered stock. He is not a part of any combination in restraint of trade. He is not in a trust. He is one among about 12,000,000 others in the United States, constituting more than one-third of the 35,000,000 men engaged in so-called gainful occupations, but he is in no labor union. He is a creator of wealth and a builder of homes. Once only has he combined with others of his class to secure a fair price for his product. The Kentucky tobacco farmer did that. He combined to defend himself against the oppression of the Tobacco Trust. It is said that the grower of a certain kind of tobacco, who had been obliged to sell his crop for 7 cents a pound, found that the trust used it in manufacturing what was known as Star Plug, and when this farmer sought to buy Star Plug he had to pay 60 cents a pound for it. Where was the difference? It was due to the sins of monopoly and overcapitalization. So these tobacco farmers took notice of the Tobacco Trust. He became a night rider. This wide difference in price was the profits on the water in the trust stocks. He found that out. But, Mr. President, the enormous wealth which the farmer has created is without any of this alloy. He has never yet failed to supply the people of his own country with food. There is no ground for fear that he can not continue to do so for many, many years to come, unless his own Government by unjust discrimination disheartens him and destroys the incentive that has been his inspiration in all the struggles of past years.

Mr. James J. Hill, who is just now working for the Great Northern Railroad Co. rather than the American farmer, and who is a deep student of scientific methods of agriculture, says:

An industrious, fairly intelligent, and exceedingly comfortable agricultural community can raise from the soil food enough for the needs of 490 persons to the square mile. Adopting that ratio, the 414,498,487 acres of improved lands in the United States on the date of the last

official record—an area materially enlarged by the present time—would support in comfort 317,350,405 people, enabling them at the same time to raise considerable food for export and to engage in necessary manufacturing employments.

But this will never come to pass if the bars are to be thrown down and the doctrine of laissez-faire followed as to the American farmer alone. Unrestrained competition with foreign peoples will tempt our farmer to follow the lines of least resistance and to reap what he can for the day's needs only.

Such a policy holds out to him no hope for the future.

It will increase the number of abandoned farms, encourage soil waste and neglect, and mark the beginning of the end of the American farmer in many lines of food production.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I should like to ask the Senator whether abandoned farms have not been brought about under the system of Republican high protection? Previous to Republican high protection, did we ever hear of abandoned farms? Yet throughout New England—not in the far Dakotas, but throughout New England—farm after farm is to-day abandoned under the iniquitous system of your so-called high protection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the Senator from New Jersey will be patient, I will discuss that, and I will show that under the present tariff on farm products and under present conditions, whatever abuses there may be, there has been a falling off in the number of abandoned farms even in New England, and we want to let the progress we are now making go on.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. That has been largely due to immigration and not to the iniquitous system that has burdened the farmer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not agree with the Senator in his claim that it is because of immigration. It is because farming has become profitable, and as long as farming can be kept profitable the number of your abandoned farms will continue to decrease.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. One moment. May I ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to ask under what administration and what public policy this horrid system of congestion takes place in the great city of New York.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is one of the—

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I want to ask under what system and under what administrative policy this horrid condition that is pictured in the eloquent address of the Senator took place? Was it under Republican policy or some other policy? Answer, please; answer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We had in my recollection, as young as I am, about four years of Democratic rule, and I do not remember that the conditions were alleviated one particle during that period.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. You have not alleviated them in 10 times four years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I say this will never come to pass if the bars are thrown down and the products of the alien farmers admitted upon an equal basis with our own. Speaking of abandoned farms, Secretary Wilson, in the Yearbook for 1909, says:

The United States has been developing for agricultural purposes an area as large as the whole of Europe, while its population is but little larger than that of any of the several European countries.

So much has fashion and sentiment had to do with this agricultural development that many of the lands, particularly in the Eastern States, have been practically abandoned, so far as profitable agricultural use is concerned, by the shifting and moving of our agricultural population into new regions in which lands are purported to be cheaper and in which the advertised inducements have been proportionately large. With the rapid extension also of our industrial life and the opportunities offered in the past in business and in the professions, the cities have called upon the country for clear brains and vigorous bodies to such an extent that large areas have become so depopulated of active, vigorous minds and bodies that the stock is insufficient to repopulate the country districts. The result is that some of the most fertile lands in our Eastern States, some of the most fertile lands in the world, have been left in a condition of practical, if not actual abandonment, and the prices of provisions have increased for the simple reason that there are not enough people to actually work the soils and raise the crops necessary to feed the nonproducing population of the cities. The great problem which faces American agriculture to-day is the problem of the proper utilization of our soils and the development of our agricultural interests in spite of and in face of the allurements of the cities and the commercial and industrial vocations. It has now become as serious a problem to settle up our Eastern States as it has been in the past to settle the West. The first problem of all is to devise means of resettling the lands which have in recent years been neglected through the mistaken idea that they have been exhausted, but which can be brought back to an increasing production through a change in farm management and the infusion of new and active blood into the rural communities.



I think every patriotic citizen of the United States will readily assent to what Secretary Wilson says; but is it not very inconsistent, in face of the conditions he describes, to enter upon a national policy that will make these abandoned lands less attractive and that will accelerate emigration out of our own country and give new and increased value to farm lands beyond our borders? We have heard much in recent years about the conservation of our natural resources. In 1908, while I was governor of the State I now have the honor in part to represent, I attended a notable conference of the governors of the States of the Union, which met upon the invitation of the President, who at that time was Mr. Roosevelt. In a most remarkable address delivered at that conference Mr. James J. Hill discussed the necessity of conserving our soils. He said:

There are two ways in which the productive power of the earth is lessened: First, by erosion and the sweeping away of the fertile surface into streams and thence to the sea; and, second, by exhaustion through wrong methods of cultivation. The former process has gone far. Thousands of acres in the East and South have been made unfit for tillage. Far more ruinous is the process of soil exhaustion. It is creeping over the land from East to West. The abandoned farms that are now the playthings of the cities' rich, or the game preserves of the patrons of sport, bear witness to the melancholy change. New Hampshire, Vermont, northern New York show long lists of them. \* \* \* When prices of farms should rise by increase of population in many cases they are falling. Between 1880 and 1900 the land values of Ohio shrank \$60,000,000. Official investigation of two counties in central New York disclosed a condition of agricultural decay. In one land was for sale for about the cost of improvement, and 150 vacant houses were counted in a limited area. In the other population in 1905 was nearly 4,000 less than it was in 1855.

And, yet, he continues:

We might expand our resources and add billions of dollars to our national wealth by conserving soil resources \* \* \* for there is good authority for the assertion that a farmer could take more from the same area of ground in four years' grain crop than seven now gives him, leaving the product of the other three years, when the land rested from grain, as a clear profit due to better methods. \* \* \* Nearly 36 per cent of our people are engaged directly in agriculture; but all the rest depend upon it. In the last analysis commerce, manufactures, our home market, every form of activity, run back to the bounty of the earth by which every worker, skilled and unskilled, must be fed and by which his wages are ultimately paid. \* \* \* Of our farm area only one-half is improved. It does not produce one-half of what it could be made to yield—not by some complex system of intensive culture, but merely by ordinary care and industry intelligently applied.

Placing the farmer of the United States upon a free-trade basis, so far as the vast and undeveloped empire of Canada is concerned, while leaving him no choice in the purchase of manufactured products, except to buy them in a protected market, will not help this situation. It will make a bad matter far worse, which, on the other hand, is rapidly curing itself. The American farmer has slowly forced his way across a vast continent. Each generation has opened a new empire of virgin soil which has, in a way, become a competitor of the older section of which it became an offshoot, but the process has gone on under full and complete free-trade relations between the States embracing all subjects of interstate commerce, and the new country has been formed into States, from time to time coming into the Union, being a part of the same people, owing allegiance to one Nation, all contributing alike to its support. In time the advantages and disadvantages have balanced each other; a loss in one thing has been offset by gain in another. During the past 10 years agriculture has been improving in the East as well as in the West, and land values have been moving upward there as elsewhere. Why should this splendid advance be now disturbed by an unfair proposal of the Canadian farmer, who assumes no burden of this Government, but owes allegiance to another, which refuses to abandon the protective tariff upon those manufactured articles which the American farmer does not sell but which he is obliged to buy?

Mr. Mark A. Carleton, who has been in charge of grain investigation in the Bureau of Plant Industry, calls attention to the fact that the total land area of the United States is nearly 2,000,000,000 acres. In 1900 less than half of this area was included in farms, only about one-fifth of the farm area was improved, and of the area improved less than 3 per cent was devoted to wheat culture. In 1850 our total improved farm acreage was 113,032,614 acres; in 1900, 414,498,487 acres. In 1866 our total acreage of wheat was 15,424,496 acres; in 1900, 41,971,000 acres, only 4 per cent of our total farm acreage. As a matter of fact, Mr. Carleton says the yield of wheat per acre in the United States is not decreasing, but has, on the contrary, increased. He gives 10-year averages of yield per acre in this country, from 1866 to 1905, as follows:

	Bushels.
1866-1875	11.9
1876-1885	12.3
1886-1895	12.7
1896-1905	13.5

At the same time he shows that the consumption of wheat by our people per capita has been materially increasing, as follows:

	Bushels.
1870	5.02
1880	5.52
1890	5.49
1900	5.11
1906	6.39
1908	6.34

He shows that we have sufficient land adapted to wheat raising for all our domestic needs for 50 years to come; that we have at least 80,000,000 acres of farm land adapted to this purpose.

Let American farmers be encouraged to cultivate this wheat land and raise this wheat. It will not increase the price of bread, but it will strengthen our rural population and increase the prosperity of the American farmer. Germany protects her agriculture. England maintains free trade in farm products. James J. Hill, in his book, *Highways of Progress*, thus compares the two countries:

How to meet German competition is to-day the study of every intelligent leader of industry and every cabinet on the Continent of Europe. \* \* \* Agricultural industry has not been slighted. Behold a contrast that throws light upon the idle host of England's unemployed, marching despondently through the streets whose shop windows are crowded with wares of German make. Between 1875 and 1900, in Great Britain, 2,691,428 acres, which were under cereals, and 755,255 acres which were under green crops, went out of cultivation. In Germany during the same period the cultivated area grew from 22,840,950 to 23,971,573 hectares, an increase of 5 per cent.

Mr. Hill also significantly remarks:

Agriculture in England has suffered in the last 25 years by the opening of new land in America and the cheapening of the world's transportation.

And our new Tariff Board, as one of the results of its recent investigation of land values in Canada, makes the following comment (p. 84) in regard to the value of farm lands in Ontario:

Ontario, while reporting the highest Canadian land value, shows the lowest Canadian rate of increase. It is worthy to note that Ontario is feeling the competition of western Canada, just as some years ago the eastern part of the United States felt the competition of our western lands.

This process of restoring worn-out lands and maintaining the productivity of the soil involves a vast expenditure each year for fertilizers. The Canadian farmer, sowing spring wheat upon the virgin soil in Alberta and Saskatchewan, can raise a good yield without using any fertilizers at all.

According to the report of the Tariff Board (p. 94), the average yield of spring wheat per acre in 1910 in the United States was 11.7 bushels; in Canada, 15.53 bushels. Of winter wheat the yield per acre was 15.8 bushels; in Canada, 23.49 bushels. A much heavier yield per acre in Canada upon much cheaper priced land. Besides I find from the advance sheets of the census of 1910, covering 29 States and the District of Columbia, being Northern and New England and Western States, but including also Maryland and West Virginia—and all being States which raise either spring or winter wheat—that these States in 1900 paid \$26,062,000 for fertilizers and in 1910 \$40,409,000 for fertilizers, an increase in that item of expense alone of 51 per cent.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Will the Senator permit me a word here?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. I do not care for extended remarks, though.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. No; I shall not make any. But fertilizer, of which the Senator speaks, is a prime necessity in this country and growing more and more so each year. Then I ask, if the Senator's heart beats so fondly for the farmer, why is it that in your tariff scheme you have not relieved fertilizer from the iniquitous tax which is a burden? Kainit, German salts, which is the basis of fertilizer, and the other fertilizers—

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am afraid the Senator from New Jersey is making a speech.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. And the other fertilizers that are controlled by the great Standard Oil Co. are all on the tariff list. So, if the Senator believes that which he speaks, lift the burden and let us have that fertilizer free, so that we need not ask odds of Canada or any other country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As to my sincerity, I can not help the Senator's incredulity, but this very much accursed Payne tariff law did take the tariff off of sulphate of ammonia, and our southern brethren were all demanding it, because it went into fertilizer. We did something, after all.



In 1900 these States paid the sum of \$245,413,000 cash for labor upon farms, and in 1910 \$432,481,000, an increase of 76 per cent. During these 10 years the number of farms in Colorado increased 86 per cent; Idaho, 76 per cent; Montana, 94 per cent; Nevada, 22 per cent; North Dakota, 64 per cent; Oregon, 26 per cent; South Dakota, 47 per cent; Washington, 68 per cent; Nebraska, 6 per cent; Kansas, 2 per cent, while there was a slight decrease in the number of farms in Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Ohio, and a slight increase in Maine, Maryland, and West Virginia. The average increase in the number of farms in the United States during the period is 13.5 per cent.

The cash value of the agricultural implements upon the farms in this great group of States was \$556,035,000 in 1900, and in 1910 it was \$938,902,000, an increase of 50.7 per cent. There was a substantial increase in the value of the farming implements on the farms in each of these States. As great as 217 per cent in Idaho, 212 per cent in North Dakota, 187 per cent in Montana, 176 per cent in South Dakota, 166 per cent in Washington, 81 per cent in Wisconsin, 78 per cent in Missouri, 74 per cent in Minnesota, 65 per cent in Iowa, 73 per cent in Michigan, 77 per cent in Nebraska, 64 per cent in Kansas, 62 per cent in Ohio, 39 per cent in Pennsylvania, and 49 per cent in New York. And all these implements came from the highly protected manufactories of the United States. Besides opening up new farms, paying out millions and millions of dollars for fertilizers, and for farm labor, and for farm implements, the American farmer during the past 10 years has been erecting new farm buildings and improving the old ones.

The census returns just out for 1910 show an enormous increase in the value of buildings on the farms in this group of States during the 10 years from 1900 to 1910. In Colorado that increase was 183 per cent; in Connecticut, 45 per cent; in Idaho, 267 per cent; in Illinois, 71 per cent; in Indiana, 89 per cent; in Iowa, 89 per cent; in Kansas, 79 per cent; in Maine, 54 per cent; in Maryland, 42 per cent; in Massachusetts, 22 per cent; in Michigan, 79 per cent; in Minnesota, 120 per cent; in Missouri, 81 per cent; in Montana, 164 per cent; in Nebraska, 118 per cent; in New Hampshire, 23 per cent; in New York, 40 per cent; in North Dakota, 262 per cent; in Oregon, 127 per cent; in Pennsylvania, 26 per cent; in Rhode Island, 30 per cent; in South Dakota, 231 per cent; in Vermont, 45 per cent; in West Virginia, 67 per cent; in Wisconsin, 85 per cent; in Washington, 233 per cent; in Ohio, 67 per cent.

There has been a remarkable increase in the value of farm lands in the United States, and it has not been confined to any locality. It has occurred in New England and the East as well as in the Central West and Northwest. This increase indicates that the attention of the people is turning again to the country and to farm lands.

Mr. President, how fatal would be the mistake should we now check this tendency to "go back to the American farm" by inviting an era of free trade in farm products with Canada. During the 10 years from 1900 to 1910, according to the census returns for 29 States, the total value of farm land alone increased as follows:

Colorado, 300 per cent; Idaho, 518 per cent; Illinois, 106 per cent; Connecticut, 36 per cent; Indiana, 93 per cent; Iowa, 122 per cent; Kansas, 188 per cent; Maine, 74 per cent; Maryland, 35 per cent; Massachusetts, 32 per cent; Michigan, 45 per cent; Minnesota, 82 per cent; Missouri, 104 per cent; Montana, 394 per cent; Nebraska, 231 per cent; Nevada, 163 per cent; New Hampshire, 25 per cent; New Jersey, 31 per cent; New York, 28 per cent; North Dakota, 321 per cent; Oregon, 262 per cent; Pennsylvania, 9 per cent; Rhode Island, 11 per cent; South Dakota, 376 per cent; Vermont, 27 per cent; West Virginia, 53 per cent; Wisconsin, 71 per cent; Washington, 419 per cent; Ohio, 57 per cent.

But should we have free trade in farm products with Canada, our chief rival in the production of cereal grains would be the farmers of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, and we would be at a disadvantage.

Land in Wisconsin worth \$57 per acre, in Michigan worth \$46 per acre, in Iowa worth \$109 per acre, in Minnesota worth \$46 per acre, in North and South Dakota worth \$40 per acre, yielding an average of 11.7 bushels of spring wheat to the acre and 15.8 bushels of winter wheat to the acre, must compete with land in Manitoba worth \$29 per acre, in Saskatchewan worth \$22 per acre, in Alberta worth \$20 per acre, yielding 15.53 bushels of spring wheat and 23.49 bushels of winter wheat per acre, with the barley average yield per acre 24.6 bushels in Canada and 22.4 bushels in the United States; flaxseed, 4.8 bushels in

the United States and 7.97 bushels in Canada; oats, 31.9 bushels per acre in the United States and 32.79 bushels in Canada; hay, 1.33 tons per acre in the United States and 1.82 tons per acre in Canada; and the average yearly wage of farm hands in Canada \$250 to \$300, as against \$300 to \$360 per year in Minnesota and the Dakotas. With the tariff on farm products coming into this market from Canada entirely removed, the farmer in Iowa, who owns 160 acres of land worth \$100 per acre, could sell it, take the \$16,000, and buy 800 acres of land in Alberta—just five times the quantity he had before, each acre of which will yield more wheat, oats, barley, or flaxseed than an acre of Iowa land.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish the Senator would let me finish this sentence, so as not to have it broken in two, and then I will yield. I am speaking about the farms of the West, and I would like to have the Senator listen to it. I say the farmer in Iowa who owns 160 acres of land worth \$100 per acre could sell it, take the \$16,000, and buy 800 acres of land in Alberta—just five times the quantity he had before—each acre of which will yield more wheat, oats, barley, or flaxseed than an acre of Iowa land, or of Wisconsin, Minnesota, or Dakota land, as the case may be. Is it not perfectly plain that the result will be a depression in the values of Iowa, Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin land and a great boom for the Canadian farmer at the expense of the American farmer?

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from South Dakota has just called attention to the fact that land in Iowa is worth \$100 per acre and in South Dakota \$46 per acre. I should like to ask him whether the growing of wheat in South Dakota on land worth \$46 an acre has proved a disastrous competition to the growing of wheat in Iowa on land worth \$100 an acre?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think so; but—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, I should like to ask the Senator how it is going to prove a disaster to this country to have Canadian wheat come in grown on their cheaper land, so that it will compete with the wheat grown on the land of Iowa or of South Dakota or of Nebraska, the price of which varies greatly?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Senator lives in the State of Nebraska and he certainly knows that in the State of Nebraska, in the State of Iowa, in the State of Illinois the chief product is corn—corn, cattle, and hogs—and those States do not come in contact with Canada as the Dakotas and Minnesota, because we are cereal-growing States while they are not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to say to the Senator that Nebraska grows many million dollars' worth of wheat every year and has not felt that the competition with South Dakota on her cheaper lands is at all disastrous. I want to say that wheat land in the United States varies enormously in value; that it varies more in value in the different States than the land in South Dakota varies from the land in Canada.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have discussed that. There is a self-adjustment, a give and take, a loss and gain, an equilibrium, and we are perfectly satisfied with it where we are all bearing the same burdens, giving allegiance to the same Government, acting in loyalty to the same system. It is true that it has many, many times depreciated the value of our lands. I remember when my people lived in central Ohio 30 years ago they thought their land was worth \$100 an acre and it went down to \$25 an acre, because they could not compete with the great empire of the West that developed as it did; but it afterwards regained its value; it was all in the United States, and adjusted itself.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that at the very time the new State of Oklahoma was being opened to settlement hundreds of thousands of acres of land were being thrown into corn cultivation, and at the same time the corn land of Iowa and Nebraska and Kansas had their greatest advance in value and did not appear to suffer from that competition.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I remember that they used to talk about burning corn for fuel in Iowa.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That was before the days when Oklahoma was opened to corn cultivation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not prepared to question the Senator in that respect. If you throw the bars down, you are going to drop our price and you are going to raise theirs until they reach a level. There is no escape from that conclusion.



What is called the "farm price per bushel" of cereals by the Tariff Board was uniformly higher in 1910 in the United States than in Canada, as the following list shows:

Wheat:	Per bushel.
New York	\$0.96
Indiana	.87
Illinois	.88
Michigan	.89
Wisconsin	.92
Minnesota	.94
Iowa	.85
Missouri	.87
North Dakota	.90
South Dakota	.89
Montana	.86
Kansas	.84
Saskatchewan	.65
Manitoba	.80
Ontario	.88
Flaxseed:	
New York	2.20
Wisconsin	2.20
Minnesota	2.30
Iowa	2.20
Missouri	2.10
North Dakota	2.35
South Dakota	2.29
Nebraska	2.25
Kansas	2.10
Montana	2.40
Manitoba	2.09
Saskatchewan	2.08
Alberta	1.87

The average yield of oats per acre in Canada in 1910 was 32.79 bushels. In the United States it was 31.9 bushels. Its farm value per bushel was 32 cents in Alberta, 28½ cents in Saskatchewan, 21 cents in Manitoba, and 36 cents in Ontario. Its farm price per bushel in Montana was 46 cents; North Dakota, 37 cents; Minnesota, 32 cents; Michigan, 35 cents; New York, 42 cents.

The barley farmer has received an object lesson in regard to the effect upon the price of his barley by removing the tariff from Canadian barley, which he will not soon forget.

The great barley Provinces of Canada are Ontario and Manitoba. The average yield in Ontario is 4 bushels above that of Wisconsin, 8 bushels above that of Minnesota, 1 bushel above that of New York, and less than 1 bushel above that of Iowa. The highest farm prices per bushel—77 cents and 76 cents—are reported from New Hampshire, Maine, and Nova Scotia. The lowest farm prices per bushel—36 cents, 38 cents, and 39 cents—are reported from Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba, respectively.

There are two well-defined barley-growing regions in Canada, Ontario and the eastern Provinces, and western Canada. Eastern Canada, including Ontario, has long been noted as one of the finest barley-growing regions in the world, and before the present duty was placed upon it large quantities of this Ontario barley were malted in the United States. But Ontario has steadily declined in the production of high-grade malting barley. Next to Ontario in importance as a barley-producing Province comes Manitoba, but for a number of years barley production in Manitoba has been practically stationary.

Since 1905 some barley has been grown farther to the west, in Saskatchewan and Alberta. The soil and climate of western Canada are so favorable that its barley is sold at a premium in English markets, but under present conditions greater profit is apparently found in other crops.

While their barley enterprise has been standing still our farmers have been making money out of it. Now you want to tear the bars down and give the benefit of it to whom? To the Brewers' Trust.

As shown by Table 15 in the report of the Tariff Board, page 99, Minnesota is the heaviest producer of barley near the Canadian border, her crop in 1910 being nearly 27,000,000 bushels. Wisconsin comes next with 22,429,000 bushels; South Dakota is third with 18,655,000 bushels; North Dakota is fourth with 15,045,000 bushels.

Of the Canadian Provinces, Ontario is the largest producer. In 1910 her total yield was 20,727,000 bushels. Manitoba came next with 13,826,000 bushels. The average yield per acre in the United States was 22.4 bushels; in Canada 24.62 bushels. In Ontario the farm price is 53 cents per bushel, and in Manitoba 39 cents per bushel. Notwithstanding the tariff shuts Canadian barley out of our market, the production of barley has increased in Canada. It appears from a table found on page 100 of the report of the Tariff Board that in 1900 all the Provinces in Canada produced 20,322,666 bushels, and in 1909 they produced 48,810,685 bushels. In 1910 the United States produced 162,227,000 bushels, while all the Provinces produced 45,147,600 bushels. Unusual drought in North Dakota and part of South Dakota explains why our crop for 1910 was less than for 1909. That was not a normal barley year. Previous to 1897 the rate

of duty on barley was 30 per cent ad valorem. By the tariff law of 1897 this duty was increased to 30 cents per bushel. Under the old rate there were large importations of barley from Canada into the United States. In 1894 more than 2,000,000 bushels were imported. In 1897 over 1,000,000 bushels. But after the imposition of the flat duty of 30 cents per bushel importations ceased. In 1909 only 2,420 bushels were imported. Under the McKinley law, from October 1, 1890, to August 27, 1894, there was a duty on barley of 30 cents per bushel, the same as now.

In 1892, under this duty, the December price per bushel in Chicago ran from 65 cents to 67 cents. The May price for the same year was 65 cents.

In 1893 December barley in Chicago ran from 52 cents to 54 cents; May barley from 55 cents to 60 cents.

In 1894 December barley in Chicago ran from 52½ cents to 53½ cents, and May barley from 51 to 52 cents.

In 1894 the tariff on barley was materially reduced, from 30 cents per bushel to 30 per cent ad valorem; and in 1895 December barley in Chicago ran from 33 cents to 40 cents, and May barley from 25 cents to 26 cents.

In 1896 December barley ran from 22 cents to 37 cents, and May barley from 24½ cents to 35 cents.

In 1897 December barley ran from 25½ cents per bushel to 42 cents, and May barley from 36 cents to 53 cents.

Then, on July 24, 1897, the old rate of 30 cents per bushel was restored by the Dingley law, and has been continued in our present law, and the price of barley has steadily advanced, as shown by the following:

[Cents per bushel.]

Years.	December high and low price in Chicago.		May high and low price in Chicago.	
	Low.	High.	Low.	High.
1898.....	40	50½	36	42
1899.....	35	45	36	44
1900.....	37	61	37	57
1901.....	56	63	64	72
1902.....	36	70	48	56
1903.....	42	61½	38	59
1904.....	38	52	40	50
1905.....	37	53	42	55½
1906.....	44	56	66	85
1907.....	78	102	60	75
1908.....	57	64	66	75
1909.....	55	72	(1)	(1)
1910.....	78	82	(1)	(1)

<sup>1</sup> Not given.

These figures are taken from Table 17, page 101, Report of the Tariff Board. This board also reports (p. 105) that—

the price of barley in Canada is generally below the price of the United States. From 1900 to 1909 the Chicago price ranged from 1 cent to 46 cents above the Winnipeg price. Half of this time the difference was above 13 cents.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do, if the Senator wishes just to ask a question. I do not want to keep the Senate unduly long.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota yields.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator hold that the passage of the tariff on barley raised the price of barley in this country?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do.

Mr. REED. Who pays ultimately that increased price?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The man who drinks the beer, I presume.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator hold that that is true of the tariff on all farm products?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not.

Mr. REED. You do not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not. I will demonstrate it, if the Senator will permit me, right here, and we will save time. I am going into that quite fully, and I will demonstrate that the small tariff on this cereal as it leaves the farm is not a factor when you consider the loaf of bread. However, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] elaborated on that so completely and made it so plain that I do not think it will be necessary for me to spend much time on it. But when it comes to the loaf of bread, the difference is absolutely inconsequential.

Mr. REED. I do not want to pursue the matter further than to get clearly the Senator's view. As I understand it, if you increase the price of barley by a tariff, the man who drinks the beer pays the increased cost?



Mr. CRAWFORD. He will not in this case. If we pass this Canadian tariff it will not change the price of a glass of beer, but I will demonstrate before I get through that your Brewers' Trust and your distillers are getting something here that is an absolute outrage, when it comes to the American farmer, and you are giving it to them.

Mr. REED. I trust the Senator is not delivering over the Brewers' Trust to me.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I hope not.

Mr. REED. As my trust.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not wish you any harm.

Mr. REED. I wanted to pursue my question to a direct answer. I understand the Senator to say that the tariff upon barley increased the price which was ultimately paid by the man who drank the beer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think that would really be a disaster, but it may be true as a fact.

Mr. REED. If that is true then why will not an increase of the price of wheat ultimately be paid by the man who eats the bread?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the Senator will do me the honor to remain here until I finish my remarks I will make it plain to him that the way this bill is presented to the Senate it leaves a tariff of 50 cents a barrel on flour while it takes the tariff off of wheat, and it will not decrease the price of bread a farthing, but it will give the manufacturers of flour an undue and unfair advantage at the expense of the American farmer. I will do that as to every item in this bill relating to farm products, but I do not care to be diverted at this part of my remarks to go into that.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota declines to further yield.

Mr. REED. I will remain to hear the Senator, but I will remind him that we are furnishing a majority of the audience who are remaining to hear the Senator.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I do not take it up I will thank the Senator for calling my attention to it.

Speaking of hay, the Tariff Board says that Ontario, which produces more hay than New York, reports an average yield of 1.84 tons as against New York's average of 1.32 tons per acre. The highest American farm price—over \$15 per ton—is reported from New Hampshire and from Wisconsin. The highest Canadian price, \$14.58, is that quoted for Alberta. The Ontario price is \$10.21 per ton as against the New York price of \$13.70.

Flaxseed is a staple crop in several northwestern States near the Canadian border. In 1910, because of drouth, the yields in Minnesota and the Dakotas fell far below normal. But despite these low yields in 1910 South Dakota and Minnesota each produced nearly as much flaxseed as all Canada; North Dakota produced about 2,000,000 bushels more than Canada. Take the tariff off flaxseed and the situation will swiftly change. The yield of bushels per acre in 1910 was 11.79 bushels in Manitoba, 7.87 bushels in Saskatchewan, and 4.48 bushels in Alberta; 3.6 bushels in North Dakota, 5 bushels in South Dakota, 8 bushels in Nebraska, 7 bushels in Montana. The highest farm price was \$2.40 per bushel in Montana; the lowest \$2.10 in Kansas. In Canada the highest farm price per bushel was \$2.08 in Saskatchewan, and the lowest \$1.87 in Alberta. Prepared flaxseed is known as linseed, and the flaxseed crop is used by the Linseed Oil Trust in the United States.

Ontario and Quebec are great dairying Provinces. Quebec has an excellent local breed of dairy stock and Ontario is favorably situated and well equipped for the production of fine grades of dairy goods. The necessary foodstuffs are available and the skill of her dairymen is acknowledged. The Tariff Board reports that there are 856,151 milch cows in Quebec and 1,243,680 in Ontario, while Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont combined have 582,000; New York, 1,771,000; Michigan, nearly 1,000,000; Wisconsin, 1,500,000. It is true that east Canada is not equipped for raising and fattening beef because Indian corn is neither cheap nor abundant there; but Indian corn is not a factor of the first importance in the maintenance of dairy herds. What are known as mill feeds are much cheaper in Canada than in the United States. The prices of bran and middlings are constantly lower at Winnipeg than at Minneapolis; in Toronto the prices of these products are constantly lower than at Buffalo; also lower at Montreal than at Buffalo. The Tariff Board reports that on February 26 the price of bran in Winnipeg was \$19 per ton and of middlings \$20, while on the same day—thanks to the Millers' Trust—the Iowa farmers were paying \$25 to \$28 per ton for bran and \$27 to \$30 for middlings.

The great dairy countries of the world are Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and Russia. It is only in recent years that the American farmer has developed what is known as modern dairying. Last year the total export of cheese by all the countries of the world was 485,000,000 pounds, of which Canada exported 172,000,000 pounds, and the United States only 10,000,000 pounds. Canada also exports about 6,000,000 pounds of butter annually.

The American farmer and dairyman can not but feel that he is unjustly discriminated against by a proposal which will admit such a competitor into our home market without the imposition of any import duty whatever. The Dominion is looking after its farmers and their welfare. Why should the United States not remain loyal to all its citizens? Why discriminate against the farmer? The Provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba are building up dairying interests by subsidizing Government creameries. A farmer living at a distance from a creamery ships his cream by express, and the express charges are rebated. Consul General John E. Jones, of Winnipeg, reports that before the Government creamery was established there in 1908 dairy butter sold for 12½ cents per pound in trade; but that from July 1 to the end of October, since the opening of the creamery, the lowest price paid by the Government was 21½ cents per pound and the highest price was 31½ cents per pound for butter fat, payments made in cash twice a month.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from South Dakota has been talking for a long time. I know that he is far from well. I ask him if he would not prefer to continue to-morrow?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know but that almost an apology is due to the Senate, but I feel constrained to discuss this question at some length. It is a matter my constituents look at with tremendous seriousness, and I feel under the most profound obligation to do what I can to get this case squarely before the country for them. While I have not been very well, I have talked for a good while and I would appreciate it if I might go on to-morrow.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 18, 1911, at 2 o'clock p. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 17, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee for every great soul who has climbed the heights, caught a vision, evolved a truth, made a discovery, invented a machine, a device, caused two blades of grass to grow where one grew, wrote a book, a poem, a song, painted a picture, carved a statue, reared an altar to his God, founded a hospital, a school, a college, or gave greater freedom of thought and action to mankind. So may it be our desire and our good fortune. And Thine be the praise forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### AMERICAN SUGAR REFINING CO.

The SPEAKER. When the House adjourned yesterday evening the matter before the House was the resolution (H. Res. 172) of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], and the immediate matter was the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] to refer that resolution to the Committee on Rules. The immediate matter is to take a vote on that motion.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that it is not my wish to take snap judgment or to make any technical contention about the passage of the resolution now pending as introduced by me on yesterday, but there are a few plain statements I desire to make to the membership of this House in order that the case may be thoroughly understood. About a week ago the House adopted a resolution providing for the investigation of the American Sugar Refining Co., commonly known as the Sugar Trust. In that resolution there was a provision for the House to elect a committee of nine members. For satisfactory reasons the election of the